

Guests: Brian Collier, President, Graduate & Professional Student Association; Jeff Wilson, Director, School of Health Administration Policy; Bob Weigand, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Department of Family and Human Development, and Richard Fabes, Chair, Family and Human Development

1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Tony Garcia at 3:21 p.m.

2. Approval of the Previous Minutes (March 29, 2004).

The minutes of March 29, 2004 were posted on the web site and emailed to senators. Hearing no objections, the minutes of March 29 stand approved as written.

3. Announcements and Communications.

3.A Senate President's Report (Tony Garcia).

I will ask all Senators to observe a moment of silence for our service men and women from Arizona who are serving in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The first item before us today is: we have passed a new methodology to run our meetings. We have a consent agenda item today. I would like to announce that anyone who has an objection to that item (Senate Motion #13 in the agenda) please state your objection now. Hearing no objections, the consent item is passed.

I am happy to announce the results of the 2004 Academic Assembly election:

**President-elect:** Susan Mattson  
**Secretary of the Senate:** Anne Kopta  
**Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure:** Jere Humphries  
**Academic Professional Grievance Committee:** Deborah Abston and Judy Grace (regular members) and Dan Brune and Renu Sharma (alternate members)  
**Governance Grievance Committee:** Mary Benin, Paul Privateer and Timothy Wong  
**Committee on Academic Professionals Status:** Elizabeth McNeil and Dan Stanton (regular members) and John Wheatley and William Sharp (alternate members).

Congratulations, and they are now part of our official record. I also want to give you some background on the way that voting went this year. Last year we first introduced electronic voting and this year we doubled our voter participation, and we exceeded our normal paper ballot participation. We would like to thank the Provost Office staff, Kristin Gasser, and IT staff, Michael Weiland, who helped us with that process. It went along very smoothly. There were some initial complaints and we fielded those at senatevoting@asu.edu and those were subsequently fixed.

**Senator Crozier:** Can you tell us how many people voted and how many people were entitled to vote?

**President Garcia:** We have a total number of voters, which is 1,858, and the total number that voted is 375 (about 20%).

We have a very full meeting today and hearing no objections, I would like to reorder the agenda and go straight to Senate Motion #14 (5.A.1).

**Senator Mattson:** Before we introduce the Senate Motion #14 for a second reading, I would like to go over a little bit of the chronology on how this came about, and why we are where we are at this point in time, and then repeat again, just a summary of what changes are being proposed for the promotion and tenure process for the university.

In January of 2003, the first task force was convened with membership from the entire university. In August, the draft report was shared with chairs and deans. In October the final task force recommendations were posted on the Provost web site, which was then opened for comments and during that time period the web site was open for comments and there was input received from various faculty, the Personnel Committee and the Executive Committee, and anybody else that wanted to weigh in. Between December 2003 and February 2004 there were meetings with the task force, and in March of this year the Provost recommendations taking into account the revisions that were suggested by the Senate committees and the various faculty that gave input were given to the Senate Personnel Committee and Executive Committee for consideration. Then in April, the Senate Motion #14 was introduced (on the Provost recommendations) and was discussed at the Senate meeting in March and now we are doing the second reading today--discussion and vote on the recommendations made by the Provost. In May that will then go to President Crow who will make his response next month. There will be a task force constituted to begin work over the summer for the implementation part of this policy. This is the broad outline piece of the policy and this task force is going to flush out the details of the implementation process, most of which will be the questions that we are asking. I had some of the same questions as most of you when we first considered this policy, and I believe that a lot of the recommendations and suggestions I have been hearing today will fit appropriately in as guides to that task force, as they consider ways of implementing the policy. In the fall the policy revisions will come back to the Senate for review. In the fall and spring of next year, we will be discussing the reports of the Implementation Task Force; the deans and the Academic Senate will all have opportunity for feedback on
that and then in the spring of 2005 the information will be disseminated to faculty, department chairs--the specifics of the implementation of this policy with the goal of implementing it in fall of 2005. So, we have summer and all next year to discuss all of the details about implementing this new policy.

Just a brief summary on how some of the timing of the process has been adjusted--that was necessary to accommodate some of the proposed changes in the process. Clear criteria need to be established by departments that don't have them, or may be working on them now, tied to the goals of the unit. There will be a maximum of 10 external letters requested, with 1/3 coming from the candidate's list. This final list is approved by the dean and then when that is sent in, the reviewer's credentials need to be provided as well. As far as the schools and colleges are concerned there will be some periodic review by the deans that has been established and that brings them more into play in this process, at least for a current evaluation. The college personnel committee can consult with external scholars; this is not true at the present time. Information can be added to the file at each level if needed; this is not true at this point, what goes in goes in and that is it. The schools and colleges are still responsible for full documentation of the cases--to say that this is a case that should go to the university level. As far as the campus and university are concerned, all the promotion and tenure cases go to the University Provost, and the President makes the final decision. This has always been an established criterion--if Dr. Coor chose to delegate it to the Provost and Dr. Crow doesn't, that is well within the ABOR guides for promotion and tenure. The ad hoc committees that are suggested to be formed come from ASU faculty, with a minimum of 5 for each case--the specifics of who is on this ad hoc committee, who suggests them, will all be worked out. The candidates also specify which standing ad hoc committees they wish to review their case. The ad hoc committees are made up of people in closely related disciplines the candidate, just as at the NIH, which is the only federal agency that I am familiar with; the applicant grant specifies which study section they want to have review their proposal and if they don't necessarily like where it gets assigned, we do have a mechanism of protest, appeal request, that it be sent to a different section for valid reasons. The ad hoc committee, the President and the Provost may consult externally. Usually it is with the candidate's letter writers. The university and/or the campus provost then charge each committee and set the context of the case within that department's criteria and goals. The Dean will select the advocate, who will usually be the chair; the candidate can discuss and request another senior faculty if that is felt to be more advantageous for the candidate being presented. The advocate is present at the ad hoc deliberations, presenting the case as to why this faculty member should be retained by the department, what their contributions are, and answering questions as necessary. The Provost is there to observe but does not vote. The Provost is there for observation and also to set the context for the review by the ad hoc committee. The ad hoc committee then recommends to the campus and university provost, who then makes a recommendation to the President.

I now would like to read the motion under consideration for a second reading: The Academic Senate Personnel Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of the Provost's Response to the P&T Task Force Report from March. There are some additional copies that were passed out at the last meeting. If you did not get one, there are some available. We would now like to open the floor for discussion.

Senator Thornton: These recommendations and changes by the Provost--where do we vote on them?--as I understand it, we were supposed to be voting on what was posted on the web.

Senator Mattson: We are voting on just the report from the Provost, not the task force's recommendations.

Senator Thornton: That was not made very clear to us that we were voting on the Provost's response.

President Garcia: We had the same motion on the first reading on March 29, and the provost's response letter has been posted on the web as well.
Senator Solis: I know there is much broader discussion to take place, but I have a motion addressing one part of the proposal. I will read it: It has to do with the number of letters that can be submitted.

President Garcia: If you would like to put it on the floor as an amendment to the motion go ahead.

Senator Solis: I and many of my colleagues within my unit and across the university with whom I have discussed the new tenure and promotion proposal have serious concerns about the sheer number of letters involved. If "up to 10 letters" are allowed to be submitted, it seems to us that 10 will, as a consequence, inevitably become the optimal number. In that case, notwithstanding whatever might have been the state of intention of the original proposal, both a quantitative and qualitative standard would then be in place. We propose that a fixed number 6, no more, no fewer, excellent letters be the standard, this would put applicants on a quantitatively level playing field, allowing review rules at every level to concentrate on the real issue, which is quality.

Senator Mattson: Is there any discussion of this or are there any comments?

President Garcia: First we would like to put this in the form of an amendment.

Parliamentarian Burstein: Senator Solis, you realize that if you ask for 10 letters you will probably get 6 or 7 back anyway; right now when we ask for 6 we get back as few as 2 sometimes. The idea is to get about 6 or 7 back in any case.

Senator Solis: I am talking about submitting 6 letters, not the number requested.

Parliamentarian Burstein: Well, then how do we pick the 6 that are submitted. If there is one negative and 7 good ones, do you exclude the negative letter?

Senator Solis: This is the job of the advocate. Is that not part of that job?

Parliamentarian Burstein: No, the advocate is only there to answer questions.

President Garcia: The intent of this, as was discussed in the P&T task force II as well as discussed with many of the chairs, is the idea that when you only ask for 6 letters and only get 3 or 4, that jeopardizes the candidate, especially when out of the 3 or 4 only 1 of them is substantive. So, the idea of raising the number to 10 letters and getting that many would be great, but realistically 6 or 7 is probably what we want to get.

Senator Solis: Again, I am still talking about submitting not requesting.

Parliamentarian Burstein: But the thing is that you have to ask for 10 to get 6 or 7 back.

Senator Solis: I have no problem with that. It is the number submitted that I was talking about and it is the job of the chair to make sure that the requests are implemented early enough and that we get replies back early enough to meet the deadlines, and it is also their job to make sure that the advocate is doing his or her business with regard to those letters.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: Many of my colleagues have communicated to me that this ascribes to the issue that Ted has just brought up. They are very concerned about the 10 letters, especially as there is another possibility that 10 could become the default number in people's minds, and when candidates go up with less
there is a possibility that by having fewer letters, they might look lesser. They are very happy with the
notion of 6 letters, which always has been in place as far I know--since I have been here for the last 14 years-
and we think that is satisfactory and protects the interests of the candidate.

Senator Danzig: It is part of the same bullet. I wonder if we could talk a bit about the change of 1/2 to 1/3
of the letters being the candidate's choice. I wonder if the person who proposed that amendment considered
that if it is 10--and 1/3 of 10 is how many--does the default then become 4 out of 10?

President Garcia: In going from 1/2 to 1/3, the concern has been that the candidate has typically not had the
best choice of letter writers. The goal is to make the best case possible for the candidate. The decision to
use 1/3 was a compromise from the Task Force decision, which was to use none from the candidate's list.
Provost Glick can comment further on that.

Past President Watson: I wonder if we should talk to, instead of a maximum of 10 external letters--and I
get the sense that we are requesting that to achieve at least six letters--if it would make more sense to say that
we should have a minimum of 6 letters in hand from a candidate, in which case you could still keep the
change at one-third from a candidate's list versus 1/2 (or you could keep it the way it was at 1/2). Maybe we
should be specifying the minimum number of letters that must be in hand and then request however many
letters it takes to get that 6.

Senator Solis: Does that still leave in place the possibility of submitting 10 letters? If it does, then I don't
agree.

Past President Watson: I presume if you ask for 10 letters, you might just get 10, but the assumption was
that at least what we are looking for is a minimum of 6 letters. It would also take away the notion that 8
letters is somehow better than 6 letters.

Provost Glick: Many chairs ask reviewers to serve as reviewers before they formally send out the material.
If you do that, you ought to be able to get roughly the number of responses that you send out. I don't think
you can put in a by-law that the chair or the department selects some subset of letters. It destroys the
integrity of the process. Agreed.

Vice Provost Hackett: Just so you are aware, the legality is that even when chairs contact enough people so
that they know they have a minimum number of letters coming back, and even when they do that and
national letter writers also commit to sending a letter, there are still external letter writers that do not send
their letters in. That is one of the issues that we are grappling with.

Also the "10 letters" is in effect right now--it is a procedural issue, it is not a policy. It was changed last year
and department chairs did not really appreciate doing this, but in fact when these letters come in, they make
the cases much stronger; there are more positive letters, and in fact, so far there has been no sign that the
number of letters alone is making any difference, it is more the number of quality letters. That was the point
of the task force recommendation.

A Senator: Is there a way to insert a phrase saying "6 is the optimal number of letters and to obtain those 6,
up to 10 can be invited" and another phrase saying, "Any letters submitted have to come forward as
evidence."

President Garcia: Can we put this in the form of an amendment now?
Senator Solis: If anyone can articulate this, I would welcome it. My main concern is that the quantitative aspect does not become significant, and if there is any way to avoid that. I would happy to accept.

President Garcia: I propose the following--I want to propose that as this motion is in its second reading, and we have just discussed this issue of the number of letters--if we could then create on the floor an amendment as a bullet point, and there are more than one, and if they are seconded we can vote on each of the bullet points. That way we can proceed. One of the issues, the reason that we showed the chronology is that there has been a lot of discussion up to this point, and one of the things that we have found in this process is that each time it is reintroduced, there is a renewal of discussion on many of the same issues.

Senator Johnson: It seems as though the number of 10 letters is really kind of an operational procedure. We will have committees working on operational procedures throughout the next year. Perhaps we would like to recommend to them that they consider this issue.

President Garcia: How about that as an amendment to this motion? "Operational committees should look at the following issues: 1) the number of letters." Is there a second on that motion? (A senator seconded the motion.) Is there any further discussion?

President-Elect Kerr: I think it important to retain the sense of senator Solis's concern about quality versus quantity; if there is any way to retain in that bullet point that the number of letters should be considered by the committee in order to maintain the maximum quality as opposed to a contest of quantity. Does that retain the sense of your concern? (Yes.)

President Garcia: We will now vote on that amendment to Senate Motion #14. All those in favor please indicate by saying aye. All opposed? The amendment carries. The floor is still open to discussion.

Senator Thornton: I want to make a proposal that would go under the unit level of the department--after the criteria have been established; these criteria will be made the basis of evaluation for tenure and promotion at every level. While we have no objection to the first point about the letters, we want the criteria at the department level, once established, to remain the criteria for evaluation at every level. What we are worried about is the raising of the bar as we go up. That would be a new inserted statement. It is not on the report and I am asking for it to be inserted. I would want it inserted right after the definition of "some units could benefit from the advice of external disciplinary experts" and right before the mention of outside letters. (First bullet in the summary--under department/unit).

Senator Mattson: How do you want that to be stated?

Senator Thornton: Once established, these criteria will remain the basis of evaluation for tenure and promotion at every level.

President Garcia: I have one comment, if I understand this right; the provost's report says that the unit will be setting by-laws and explicit criteria for promotion and tenure. I was also under the assumption that in that process, as well as the process of contextualization of the case made by the advocate, that would then be referred back to the ad hoc committees and it noted that this is in fact the criterion for the candidate being evaluated. So, I think that what you are suggesting is implicit in the provost's recommendation. I am trying to figure out how your amendment differs or clarifies that.

Senator Thornton: We are asking for absolute statements in the procedure. The clarification should be inserted.
Senator Mattson: This would be another bullet recommendation to the implementation committee to simply spell this out? (Yes.)

President Garcia: Is there a second to this amendment? (Multiple Seconds.) We will have discussion then.

Senator Rez: I just wanted to second that amendment, but I am puzzled about what is this council of bureaucracy we are creating--what is the problem that we have been trying to fix? What is actually broken so badly that full professors are going to have to spend most of their lives reviewing promotion and tenure cases on these ad hoc committees?

President Garcia: Senator, there is nothing broken. I think there are two things that the P&T task force II was charged with, and I think that this process all relates to the idea of having an all-university process; currently we have three different processes. The idea would be to have an all-university process, and the second charge is--how do you improve the existing process? What was mentioned is the fact that unfortunately due to the lack of disciplinary expertise at the university P&T level, that it has become bureaucratic in essence--and so rather than having another bureaucratic process, why not have a process whereby internal ad hoc committees would be created so that more information would be gathered, rather than just a bureaucratic system. That is really the spirit as it stands now.

Senator Rez: It lies in the departments; it doesn't lie in some upper level committee, however well intentioned. So, what is broken in the department that needs fixing? What are we doing--we have all these routes for people going up from assistant to associate to full professor for promotion and tenure. What are we doing about administrative appointments or targets of opportunity? Do they have to get reviewed according to strict criteria?

President Garcia: I think we will stick to the object on the floor. As to your first requirement, our president has said it well, and I think I can reiterate it, that tenure is the most important decision he can make and it involves 30 or 40 years of a person's career at the university. So, we are calling more attention to it rather than less because it is so important. So that is the short answer to your comment.

Senator Canary: I am from the Hugh Downs School and I am just wondering if the Provost would clarify whether the amendment as it was presented does in fact reflect your implicit assumptions about the process? (The amendment about the department criteria).

Provost Glick: It is our intention that every department has criteria that will be approved by the college and university level, and that those will be the criteria that we will use at all levels. So, different levels will be saying how well does this candidate perform according to the criteria that have been signed off on at every level?

Senator Thornton: I am not saying that I am disagreeing with that.

Provost Glick: I am not disagreeing with you. He asked me a question and in responding--yes, we do not find this in conflict, but it does require review of the criteria at every level.

President Garcia: Can we vote on this amendment to Senate Motion #14? All those in favor say aye. All those opposed? This amendment to Senate Motion #14 carries.
Senator Rice: I have an amendment that I would like to put forth from the faculty in Anthropology. It has to do with the changes to the case file, once the file has been submitted into the review process:

"Following submittal of the candidate's case file to the review process, new information may be added to the case file providing that:

a) the additional material is limited to categories of information already used in development of the case file, such as letters of recommendation that arrived after the filing of the case file and are from external reviewers that were on the original approved list of reviewers, letters of acceptance of manuscripts or funding of grant proposals, and publications that appeared in print after the filing of the case file OR

b) All parties (the candidate, the unit, college committees, and dean) are informed in writing of the intent to request additional information beyond that normally included in a promotion and tenure packet and the general nature of that information."

Senator Mattson: And you are offering that as an amendment?

Senator Rice: I am.

Senator Mattson: Do we have a second for that (Multiple Seconds). Any discussion of this?

A Senator: Could he summarize those points?

Senator Mattson: What he is saying is what we have been saying, that you can put additional material into the file at any level. He is saying that the additional material should be limited to that which is already in the file, letters that had not come, etc. OR if there is other information that is going to be requested by whoever, ad hoc, college committees, provost, etc., that each person in that process be notified in writing of the intent to request additional information and what the nature of that information is. He is saying that the only thing coming in would still pertain to whatever is in there already, or everybody in the process needs to know ahead of time what is being requested. The second piece would be implementation-wise a little more difficult as far as timing is concerned. The first one I don't know whether I should speak to or not, it seems reasonable.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: I am again speaking as the senator-at-large from the College of Education on these items--we take some issue with the idea of information gathering as it has to do with the file that is submitted by the candidate. President Crow has talked about the unevenness of files, and that is a basic problem, the files are uneven. Many of my colleagues and I feel that sudden ad hoc nature once the file has left the department is wrong--we think that ad hoc is always open to possible mischief and that is a problem to us. We would like to see to it that there would be no information gathering at all, except for those things where papers are coming in late and letters are coming in late after the deadline.

There is a notion that the place to fix this is an improved mentoring process for the candidate and the departments should learn how to put files together in a better way, so that once the file leaves the hands of the candidate, it stays in tact.

If the idea was to make an unfair system fairer, we think that in the College of Education, my colleagues and I feel that the ad hoc nature of the information gathering makes this more unfair, and not less unfair. We would like to speak in support of the first half of that amendment, part a, where the information gathering is limited to that which simply has not come by the deadline. We accept that part.
Senator Acker: I want to piggyback on your response and suggest that if it is further context, which is often the problem according to President Crow, who said they did not context the achievements and the discoveries properly, that simply you go back to the source and request further information. That is not removing the onus on the candidate or the unit to describe the fullest information possible, but should there be any misunderstanding, why make the candidate suffer because "the case was not made", if by requesting simply more information to go back to the source, which is the candidate, his chair, that unit and say, supply this.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: I think the response of my colleagues would be that unless this were done for every candidate--this is one of those cases where equal and fair are the same. So, equal treatment in our notion is that once the file leaves the hands of the candidate that's the end of it.

President Garcia: I want to comment on this and say if you had to make a decision and your decision would be made based on the information that was 9 months old, even if it was 5 years' worth of information accumulated, would you want to do that? Or do you want to make a decision wherein something could have happened, or some more information could have been gathered, if you requested it? I have no argument about your fairness point. But the way that I look at this is--Do we want to make a decision based on information that has been somehow frozen in time? The question is also how much effort should be made so that we don't tip the balance the other way? If only those people who are savvy enough about the system--if they extract that little bit of information that makes his or her candidate better--this is the advocate system, or the ad hoc system--but what I worry about is how these cases are trapped in time, and also subject to some interpretation. Leaving it open to going back and asking people questions, certainly being open to adding new materials that came in, sounds like your college would understand that, so, what is the scenario that makes the case unequal?

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: I think that President Crow and Provost Glick need to tell us what files have looked like that have made them so uneven. I need a better description myself.

Vice Provost Hackett: Again, we made the change last year that supplements the materials and that is exactly how it has been implemented. Additional items refers to those things not received by the deadline, teaching evaluations that were not submitted the first time, things like that, and it has worked very well and there have been several cases where it would have been a NO but it ended up a YES instead. In every case so far it has advantaged the candidate. We are doing what you suggest and it seems to be working.

Parliamentarian Burstein: Not only that, ask yourself if you were on this committee, who would you ask for clarification, the people who write good letters or the people who write the one letter that denigrates your candidate? It is likely to be the one letter that denigrates your candidate, and you would like to have that person explain why they took that point of view.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: He is not talking about the advocate here; he is only talking about the ad hoc gathering of information.

Parliamentarian Burstein: He is talking about the ad hoc committee--if the ad hoc committee gets 7 letters and 1 is damning to the candidate, wouldn't it advantage the candidate that the ad hoc committee could ask that one person why they felt that way. (Much Grumbling)

Senator Colbourn: In the interest of consistency, I think that one would want it to be the case that the ad hoc committee be instructed to ask the negative referee that, not that they should have the option to ask them. If it makes sense for them to ask the negative referee, we should instruct all of the ad hoc committees to do
this because it should not be the case where just one committee decides to do this and another one decides not to.

Senator Rosales: It seems to me that once you get that letter clarified, even with 7 letters in the background, that one letter may overtake the ad hoc process with elaborate documentation, which in fact then convinces them.

Provost Glick: Let me separate what I think are two issues that are mixed here: 1) can materials be added to the file? Those are objective materials, additional teaching evaluations, papers or grants that have come in and I think the intent was to say unless it is stock material; the candidate needs to be aware of this and approve it. I think that is from my perspective a reasonable motion. 2) External consultation. I think we should try to deal with Senator Rice's issue first. The question of whether the Provost, President or a committee can get external consultation is a different issue.

Senator Rice: Perhaps to bring my motion in line with my colleague, Dr. Blumenfeld-Jones, we could strike the second part b) of my amendment; the procedure seems right now to add to the case file the categories of information that belong being put in the file, during that 9 months when the file has been circulated, but are not there yet. If we do go on to talk about letters and other kinds of information being requested from outside sources, then I will make a motion that in those cases the candidate be given full knowledge of that request being made. We want a very open and transparent situation.

Senator Acker: Since the nature of the ad hoc committee has come up, I was wondering, and I bring this up as a question--It seems to me that the greatest amount of expertise for evaluation is assembled at the unit level. That is where the national and international experts are solicited to look at the file and get the most substantive evaluations. As we move up to the college level, we move into an area where people are further removed from specifics of that discipline, and by the time we get to the university level we are trying to keep substantive reviews at the college and university level, and the original suggestion was for all those same experts that already had been solicited for letters that we bring them back on campus to be the ones to give the evaluation, but I don't think we have the resources to do that. What is being most profoundly changed in the whole task force review of P&T is that we are moving from a substantive review at the department level, and moving to provide a substantive review at the college and university level also, which was formerly more procedural. I don't think that this university can bring together ad hoc committees for such a task and this seems like a dilution of the process rather than an improvement.

Senator Mattson: Before we get into a general discussion of the ad hoc committees, may I go back to Senator Rice's proposal to amend and say that I was asking if his amendment could be another bullet point of instructions to the implementation task force, as an amendment to this--spelling out that the only materials that can be entered into the file after it has left the department are these ones that you have enumerated.

Could we go ahead and vote on that now?

Senator Thornton: I have a question.

President Garcia: Is it about this item?

Senator Thornton: Yes, it is on that point. We are talking about two different matters here--1) what can be added to the file (what can be submitted by the candidate and the chair) and 2) What can be requested?

Senator Mattson: That is why he separated them out.
Senator Thornton: He separated them out? Ok. We are only dealing with the first one? Yes.

Senator Guleserian: Would you restate the amendment clearly, please? The first part.

President Garcia: The amendment to the motion (Senate Motion #14).

Senator Mattson: "The additional material be limited to categories of information already used in development of the case file, including but not limited to: letters of recommendation that arrived after the filing of the case file and are from external reviewers that were on the original approved list of reviewers, letters of acceptance of manuscripts, or funding of grant proposals, and publications that appeared in print after the filing of the case file."--things that are already in there that you had said, i.e. I have done this, but I don't have proof of it yet. Well, now they have the proof, or additional student evaluations. This is not an inclusive laundry list; it was just examples of things that could be submitted.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: Seems like to me this is more of an implementation issue, it should be raised from the bullet list to an amendment to the original recommendation!

Senator Mattson: Provost Hackett said that it is already in effect right now, that is the only thing(s) that are allowed and that when the guidelines are spelled out--where it says you can submit materials at any level, this is what can be submitted.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: I don't think it matters what it is right now. I think it matters if we are passing this amendment, but we must put it in there now.

Senator Mattson: I would say that the other two people who made these proposals would probably agree with you, and what we have done is ask that they be submitted to the implementation task force as implementation of this policy, which says that additional materials can be submitted, which in the past until this was implemented was not allowed. Once the file left your hands, it was gone and there was nothing more you could put in the file.

President Garcia: Let's have a vote on this amendment.

A Senator: Is this amending our policy, or is this just a suggestion to the task force for next year?

Parliamentarian Burstein: All these are suggestions, issues that the task force will have to deal with.

A Senator: So, you are saying then that they do not have to deal with this if they do not want to?

Parliamentarian Burstein: The task force recommendations will come back to us for another vote.

President Garcia: We showed the timeline--at the very beginning to a little while ago, and we are halfway through this whole process. We are trying to get to the point where we collect (this semester) all the ideas and add on to what the Provost is recommending so that when things move forward when we actually see the formulation by the implementation task force of guidelines for implementation--that is really the most critical thing we will consider next year.

Senator Thornton: Let me clarify something--the first suggestion that was made, I understand that was referred back to the implementation task force, but the additional amendments that we have voted on today,
that was certainly not clear to me that we were also voting to send those to the implementation task force. Did you just say that was the case?

**President Garcia:** I thought I had said that in the beginning, and I reiterate that what we are discussing here are amendments.

**Senator Thornton:** All amendments we are making here are simply suggestions being sent to the implementation task force?

**President Garcia:** The motion that is under consideration right now is that we recommend Academic Senate approval of the Provost's response to the P&T Task Force Report. The idea would be that along with that would be the items we have passed as amendments today, to be considered by the implementation task force. These amendments are being put forward, one by one and being put into our motion #14 as attachments. I will take one more question.

**Senator Colbourn:** I am still confused. What are the amendments of that--are the amendments amending the motion that is on the floor? (Yes.) So, if we pass an amendment that changes the sense of the motion, is that a recommendation, or is that an amendment?

**President Garcia:** It is part of the overall motion.

**Senator Colbourn:** So, there is no way we can change the motion--in other words when we vote on the motion, it will be a vote for the motion itself with the approved amendments attached to it? (Correct.)

**Parliamentarian Burstein:** This becomes one of the issues that the Senate puts forward to the implementation task force.

**Senator Colbourn:** I think that I am on the same page with you now.

**President Garcia:** Ok, let's vote. All those in favor say aye please. All opposed? The amendment to the motion has carried by voice vote. At this point, if there is no other discussion I call the question.

**Senator Haynes:** I have a question, but it is not on that issue; it is a point of clarification. It is not clear to me when the second reading of this motion is going to take place.

**Parliamentarian Burstein:** What is happening is that the Provost recommendations plus any issues that we want to put forward to the implementation task force will go forward to the implementation task force, they will then implement the issue, and the implementation plan will come back to the Senate for first and second readings.

**Senator Blumenfeld-Jones:** Then it is put into ACD language? (Yes.)

**President Garcia:** Back to the chronology, this goes back to the President, even the Provost's recommendations.

**Senator Thornton:** Are we ready to make new proposals? (Yes.) I think we are all interested in probably the most substantive part of this recommendation, and that is the status of the ad hoc committees themselves. My department is worried about two things: 1) they think that ad hoc committees across the board will not guarantee the application of standard criteria for all the candidates, 2) the selection and use of expert referees.
who are not on the list agreed upon by the candidate, department chair, and the dean. So, I have a rather long proposal to substitute in:

At the University Level

We agree that reviews at the university level should be tailored, etc, but we do say this in addition: An ad hoc committee should be established only for the specific cases that warrant additional scrutiny: 1) when external reviews are divided in their evaluation of the candidate, 2) when the department's decision is highly divided, 3) when the decisions of the dean or other committees are at odds with each other, and 4) when the university committee does not have members with expertise sufficiently close to the candidates field. These ad hoc committees shall be established by the University Provost's Office with input from the candidate's, chair or director, dean, and campus provost.

I want to also make a point of information here--will non-ASU faculty be consulted? I assume yes.

President Garcia: When they are external letter writers.

Senator Thornton: I mean by these ad hoc committees?

President Garcia: That is not in the Provost's recommendations. These ad hoc committee members are ASU faculty members.

Senator Thornton: So you are saying that there is no chance at all that non-ASU faculty will be consulted?

Susan Mattson: No. You have the external letter reviewers and as it stands, the proposal says that.

Senator Thornton: No! That is not the way we understand it, what we understand is that any level information can be solicited from anywhere. I would like to put that in their proposal!

Parliamentarian Burstein: Let me say something as the chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. You have to have a consistent (university level) set of ad hoc committees in order to avoid a whole set of grievances being filed. If you only do what you suggest for the cases that are contentious, then those people who were not contentious, which were turned down will file grievances and say that the issue was unfair. You have to do the process uniformly across the university; you cannot select whom you do this for.

Senator Thornton: Has that been a procedure up until now?

Parliamentarian Burstein: Yes. However, the procedure up until now has been a university committee composed of people who don't know your record, so it is a bureaucratic issue basically. We want to have a substantive review at the university level.

President Garcia: This was discussed extensively as well in the P&T Task Force. Again, that policy has to be applied uniformly. The proposal that you just stated would automatically create conditions whereby people would go through the system in different ways.

Senator Thornton: But then each time you set up a new ad hoc committee, you are automatically setting up a different group of people.

Parliamentarian Burstein: Not necessarily. The idea is to have 5 or 6 ad hoc committees.
Senator Thornton: So, these will be standing ad hoc committees then?

Parliamentarian Burstein: No. What you will have are five or six areas of concentration and three of the people on each ad hoc committee will be in the same area of concentration, then you will have two experts that can speak to the issues.

Senator Thornton: I think the problem is that what we have before us is a very good set of proposals, and we (faculty) are being asked to say, well, just trust this later. I am afraid that in very many respects, what we are trying to do here (I am on behalf of my department) is to make sure that we do not approve things that we will have no control over later in terms of implementation. We want to know now how things are going to be set up before we start recommending things or approving them. That is not made clear that this is the way things are going to be. The entire procedure of these ad hoc committees is not clear, they are very loose and there is just too much space and leeway for a little bit of distortion, and I don't think that we can go on like this. It is not explicit enough. It is very nice to say, we would like to do this, but we want to know what is going to happen.

Parliamentarian Burstein: It can't be explicit enough because you have to implement the issue.

Senator Thornton: Then what are we getting at?

All Discuss: It is not time yet. There has to be an implementation task force set up to implement the policies. There are a lot of things that have to be worked out. This is the overview issue; this is why it is not very specific. There are two problems here. One problem is you could let the system go all the way to the ACD rewrite, and have no discussion on the Senate floor, no involvement by the senators, and no senators going back to the department explaining things to their colleagues, having this interchange, then all of a sudden we would be considering the ACD rewrite for voting or recommendation to the President, saying yea or nay on the proposed wording. That is one way to do this process. The other scenario is that there is a task force appointed and the task force makes sure its recommendations and this report are made to the Provost, then the Provost makes recommendations on that report, we get a chance to discuss it, we get a chance to have input, we get a chance to go through and talk about different issues, and this part is halfway through. The process halfway through has input from us, if that is not the case that you would have happen, then basically what you are promoting is a situation where all the plans are laid out and then somehow or another we magically make a recommendation of yea or nay on the final plan. So, if we make a recommendation of yea, we have no voice in the matter afterwards. If we make a recommendation of nay, then what was all that effort done for?

Senator Thornton: Then I would recommend that we not have ad hoc committees and continue the process we are under. I make a motion that we refuse to implement the ad hoc committees and that we continue with the University committee as it is.

President Garcia: We will do that when we vote upon the motion as a whole.

Senator Karady: We looked at this proposal in my unit and we felt that at the unit level of engineering, there are personnel committees which are doing exactly the work of the ad hoc committee. These are the peers who know the candidate best. These members of this committee are elected every two years, so they are the most qualified people to make the first letter of judgment. Therefore, may we suggest that you substitute "personnel committees" for "ad hoc committees" in the policy and that way the unit could use that committee, which is the procedure currently in engineering, which we have used over the last twenty years?
President Garcia: What we are talking about is the review at the university level. So, we cannot have the same committee look at the file at two different levels, but there will be these broad discipline areas used for the ad hoc committees to come from, and within in those areas there can be recommendations for ad hoc committee members from the department as well as from the chair, etc.

Senator Goldinger: I am not speaking for my faculty, just for myself. I have heard to me what seems to be conflicting statements—the question was asked, what is broken and the response that seemed to get consensus was that the files were uneven and that there were procedural problems evaluating each candidate fairly with respect to all other candidates. I also just heard that there is a desire for substantive review at the university or college level. I am not quite certain how those two things are equivalent to one another.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: I am sort of piggybacking onto what I have just heard. I think that what you are saying we are misunderstanding—implementation task force sure sounds like you are going to actually do something next year, and I don't think you mean that. You are just going to come up with some plans to do something, right. So, when you keep saying implementation task force, you make us very nervous that you can actually do something next year. (Much Laughter)

Senator Mattson: This is the policy, through the process, if you remember the timeline; the entire academic year is involved.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones. Yes, but I want to speak to the ad hoc committee structure, which again, my college has a lot of problems with this, and we want to the speak to the notion that was spoken to here a number of times this afternoon, that presumptive expertise lies at the local level, and that is where it should remain. The notion of substantive reviews at higher levels we don't even quite understand what the necessity for that is, since in our own homes we have internationally well-known scholars who garner great respect throughout their field, so, the notion of having more substantive review when the folks at the local level who know you best, who know your work best, speak to you—yea or nay, whatever that is that happens at the local level, that is where we think the power should stay.

Not to say that we do not understand that the President's Office is the actual deciding agent. Lattie Coor turned it over to Milt Glick, that is what he chose to do, and Michael Crow is not choosing to do that. We understand this and it has always been policy. It has just been a certain practice, this notion of "operational" is what got in here and confused people. We understand that we are all advisory up to the President, but I am not sure the President is not advisory to ABOR actually. That is my sense of it. I want to say that I am speaking for my colleagues and many in the College of Education who are uncomfortable with the notion of ad hoc committees, which we feel sets aside and diminishes the notion of local expertise at the department level.

Susan Mattson: Can I allow Provost Glick to respond here and then Senator Guleserian?

Provost Glick: Senator Blumenfeld-Jones is really addressing a critical issue—is the review above the department substantive or procedural? It has always been substantive. Now whether it was always carried out that way, and every year when I was Provost—and I would approach the UPTC and say to them, you are not simply reviewing procedures, you are reviewing and advising me on substance. Now, in most cases if the department and the college have said substantively this is good, they are right, but not in all cases. We have unevenness in the university. The President, by the Board of Regents, is designated to make those decisions. He could say, and don't think he did not ever cross anyone's mind, you know what, let everything else be procedural except the department, and I will just make the decision on my own because that is my
job. But seriously we don't want to do that. He wants to have the best possible advice. So, he looks to these committees, department, college, and university to give him advice on whether this person should be tenured or promoted. Why change from the present system--because the President would like the advice to be as knowledgeable as possible, therefore having committees closer to the field gives him more knowledge. The issue of being substantive is not a change, the only change is--do we have a single committee giving substantive advice, or do we have a set of committees? That is a worthy debate. Please know that in my view and in the policies of the Board of Regents and of the University, it is a substantive review and I have not been at every university in the world obviously, but I have been a faculty member, I have been a dean and a provost at another university--and in every one of those universities, there was substantive review at the university level. I served on committees as a faculty member, and although you see me as a university officer, I think of myself also as a faculty member. It does seem to me the reason that the Provost and President of the university is not the Provost and President of General Motors, is due in part to our academic credibility. So, I understand this issue and I am not surprised it is an issue, but please know whatever we do is going to be substantive at the President's level. We would like it to be substantive at the President's level with good advice, or substantive at the President's level without good advice. That is really where it is--how do we give the President the very best possible advice? It is a legitimate argument and please understand that I am not arguing; this is a black and white thing. But at Harvard, Columbia, and Yale and MIT even--they say there that the department faculty makes a recommendation, the chair of the department says yes or no, and if he says no, it is dead. If he says yes, it goes to the dean, who convenes all the chairs from the college and they advise the dean, who says yes or no, and if he says no, it is dead. Then it goes to the Provost who convenes all these people and they advise him or her. The provost makes a recommendation. That is an administrative controlled, kind of a clean way to do it but it really does remove the faculty input at the lowest level. Our goal is really to improve the process, from what I think is the real thing that happens. I do understand why these are legitimate arguments you have, please don't let me deny them, but I thought it was important for you to know what I believe is the case.

Senator Rosales: Provost Glick, if it is substantive--is the information that is used at your level only the information that is sent up from the unit originally? How much feedback will the department get on that information?

Provost Glick: I agree with Senator Rice that we should not be adding materials to the bio that the candidate is not aware of. I am not out to create the file. I believe the candidate has a right to see everything in the candidate's file other than the letters which are private and confidential. That is a separate issue from whether we have the authority, which we now have to ask outside experts to tell us "what is roughly expected in the world of anthropology," but I don't think we should be creating files for candidates.

Senator Rosales: But in creating files you are talking about consulting somebody else.

Provost Glick: No, I mean by creating files "bringing in new materials." We are not planning on doing that.

Senator Guleserian: I want to say something in support of what the Provost was saying. He is putting it diplomatically. I think that there is an ugly truth here--sometimes a particular department will have a very congenial person who is put up for promotion, he is good friends with the chair, the chair helps to make sure that the people selected for letters are sympathetic to him and so this person really gets favorable treatment. We do need to check on that. The college committees are supposed to do that, but it is felt that we need to check at the university level on that too, which should truly be a substantive review, and I feel this is what this is all about.
**Past President Watson:** I would like to speak just briefly in favor of the ad hoc committees as well. I do think that ad hoc committees have a better opportunity to define at the university level what the unit criteria are and to make sure that those unit criteria are well considered at the university level. I think that having ad hoc committees provides a university level review that is closer to the candidate's field and therefore can simply do a better job of that. I personally feel that last year's situation in which nobody in fine arts got through the initial promotion and tenure process—that probably would not have been the case had we had ad hoc committees at the university level. For me personally, if I were going up for promotion I would prefer to see a university level committee that had more social scientists on it—and maybe, pardon me, Susan, no nursing faculty or George, no engineering faculty, or others that I feel did not have as good a grasp of the area that I was in. I favor the ad hoc committees; I think they would do a better job than what we have now.

**Senator Ismeurt:** I don't understand how we could deal at the substantive level with an ad hoc committee at the university level that is not made up of people who are in the field. (They are in the field.) Well, those people come from the departments then.

**All Discuss:** Not necessarily. In fact they can't come from the department currently. But right now you don't have anyone who is familiar with the case, in terms of being expert in the candidate's field.

**Senator Komnenich:** You know, what has really been bothering us is in terms of this ad hoc business—which means you are doing something in place of something, which is taking the place of what the university review is, and I was glad to hear Provost Glick elaborate a little bit more on the substantive nature at all these levels with the expectation that they will all be substantive. However, it still seems to me somehow, we are putting together a group of people who are supposed to do another check on what the unit has intended, and if the recommendation comes from the unit, this seems like duplication to me. It is double the work in a sense. Why can't we, if we are really respecting the unit and we want the expertise to be there, why can't that be accepted as expertise in the field. Maybe I am missing something here.

**President-elect Kerr:** I believe that Senator Guleserian stated it in the positive way what would happen if a department chair favored this person, set up a committee for them, etc. But to answer you, Senator Komnenich, I think I would then put it in the negative sense—what if you have a department chair who just doesn't like a candidate? I was opposed to the ad hoc committees idea at first, because I thought they gave the department chair too much power, but many changes were made over the course of this year that have not only diminished that but also provided another check for that candidate (who in every other way meets the criteria of colleagues, and the discipline for promotion and tenure but somehow has gotten on the wrong side of the department chair.) So, I have come to see the ad hoc committees as a check on either favoritism at the departmental level or punitiveness at the lower level.

**Senator Komnenich:** Point of clarification, the ad hoc committee—will the composition of that be stable over a period of time, because it sounds as if they will be appointed each time a candidate is up for review.

**President Garcia:** It is conceivable that some members will be on the committee, and then there will be others that will be appointed based on the particular case. The details of this have not been worked out at this time. I think that what I would like to do is put this up for a vote (Senate Motion #14) with the amendments given. Let me state my reasoning. We have a process up to this point that has been very inclusive. There are the recommendations of the Task Force that were posted--there was a period where the provost listed all our comments and there were forums on this as well, and this was also discussed with the department chairs who we presume also shared this with the departments, as well as with the deans who discussed it. Then the provost made a series of recommendations, and they have also now been reviewed by the Senate. We have had a chance today to really discuss this in more depth and there are amendments.
Past President Watson: Point of order--Although I do not agree with her proposal, Senator Thornton is there an amendment on the floor to vote on the ad hoc committees? Was that a motion and was it seconded?

President Garcia: I don't see that as a separate amendment.

Senator Thornton: I proposed it as an amendment. I propose that we do not replace the existing University Promotion and Tenure Committee with ad hoc committees.

President Garcia: Is there a second to that amendment? (Multiple Seconds) All in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed? Not clear, so let's have a show of hands. All those in favor raise your hand to indicate Aye (22 in favor). All those opposed indicate by raising your hand (33 not in favor). The motion is defeated. So, let's go back to consider Senate Motion #14 "The Academic Senate Personnel Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of the Provost's response to the P&T Task Force Report and we have several amendments.

Parliamentarian Burstein read the amendments:
1) That the tenure and promotion criteria be established by the department and approved by the college and the university be the criteria against which a candidate is judged.

2) That the additional material be limited to categories of information already used in development of the case file, including but not limited to: letters of recommendation that arrived after the filing of the case file and are from external reviewers that were on the original approved list of reviewers, letters of acceptance of manuscripts or funding of grant proposals, and publications that appeared in print after the filing of the case file.

Senator Mattson: There was one additional amendment.

3) That the number of letters (up to ten) be reviewed by the implementation team and that they emphasize the quality of the letters as opposed to the quantity. Agreed.

President Garcia: Those are the three amendments. We will vote by a show of hands, all those in favor of the motion with the three stated amendments, please indicate by raising your hand (46 in favor). All those opposed indicate by raising your hand (17 not in favor). Senate Motion #14 with the (3) amendments passed.

May we return to where we were on the agenda? President Crow had to leave because he had a 3:45 p.m. appointment and now we have the Provost's report next.


I need to apologize because I will need to leave early also, since President Crow has a meeting that I am supposed to be in. I think this has been an enormously productive year; it has been a stressful one for some of us. (Who has not been stressed this year???)

I think reorganizations are usually just a lot of talk, but I do believe that what has come out of the design team's recommendations, modified by the president, is truly exciting, it is real, it is challenging, it is a stretch for us but I believe that if we pull it off, that in 8 years or 10 years, we will be able to say we built a new kind of university that combined the best of the old and gave us new opportunities. On a personal note, I wrote a
note to the new dean of architecture about a month ago and said--Duke, in your wildest imagination did you think that you would be given such a big sandbox to play in? You are essentially being empowered to invent downtown Phoenix. The new mayor believes that we are the anchor that will make downtown Phoenix the anchor of a great city, a great metropolis. It is a real challenge; it is a real stretch but a challenge worth our fullest efforts. I think that we have taken advantage in the most positive sense of the goodwill that exists in this university, to ask you to suspend your disbelief on some things, and you have done that and for that I am grateful. I also believe that we are through a transition period and ready now to make all these things real, and I think what is going on is extraordinary. We have new buildings, after a decade of essentially no new buildings, 15 years almost; we have a new social science building, which if they can ever get the sun to stop shining in the windows, will be a great building. We have facilities going up--AZbio--we have discussions going on for joint degrees with other enterprises.

I really think it is a very exciting time to be at ASU, and I don't think we could have possibly done what we have done over the last two years if it were not for the commitment and the good will and the willingness to take a chance on the part of this faculty and this staff. We have a collegial environment that allows us to do things other people can't do and sometimes we stretch that environment and we test it. There is a price to that, so you have to make sure the goal is worthy of the price. I am excited, and I intend for this to be my last job, and I intend for it to last a long time. (I can't decide if that is because I think retirement is a social disease or if it is because I am addicted to being provost.) I don't ever remember not being provost. It is my lifeline, but I think together we can make this an even better and greater place than the place that we inherited and helped build. So, it has been a great year in my view, not without stress but a great year, and next year will be better because we will be actually doing the things we have been talking about doing for the last 24 months. I will be happy to answer questions now. (Applause here.)

President Garcia: I would like to reorder the agenda again and have the Past Senate President's Report.

3.D Past Senate President's Report (George Watson).

It is with mixed emotions; certainly we wanted happiness and gladness in recognizing Betty Craft who has worked at ASU for so many years. Many of you know that she has been seriously ill for quite some time now. Today, I would like to introduce a resolution on Betty and her service to the university and I hope that you will also allow me to move it to a second reading. We want to have our Senate resolution published in the Insight as well, and today is the deadline to take that step.

" WHEREAS, Elizabeth Craft served with distinction as a Senator and University Affairs Chair for 7 years, on the Academic Senate University Continuing Appointment and Promotion Review Committee for 13 years, and as chair of the Senate Ad hoc Committee on Intellectual Property Rights in On-Line Works;

WHEREAS, Elizabeth Craft’s stewardship in the Academic Chairs and Directors Group, Academic Chairs and Directors Group Steering Committee, the Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee, the Ombudsperson Committee, the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Academic Professionals, the Provost’s Consultative Committee, and the University Continuing Appointment and Promotion Review Committee has been important to the university community; and

WHEREAS, Elizabeth Craft’s leadership in the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Division of Telecommunications, Board of Directors, and the National ITFS Association, Board of Directors, and the National University Telecommunications Network (NUTN) Board of Directors, has been nationally recognized both for her Directorship and for a career dedicated to excellence in education;
RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recognize Elizabeth Craft as a member of the Senate who has made outstanding service contributions to Arizona State University and promoted our shared ideal of a commitment to excellence in higher education. We extend to her the enduring gratitude and warm wishes of this Academic Assembly and this University.

I want to offer this as a resolution to the floor. The motion was seconded by Senator Verdini.

Parliamentarian Burstein: The first issue is to suspend the rules so that we can go to a second reading. All those in favor of suspending the rules please raise your hand. The resolution passes.

Past President Watson: Bill, as a second to this motion can you speak just briefly to the motion.

Senator Verdini: Betty Craft will be retiring from Arizona State University after 22 years of service. She is not here today; I am here in her place because she is seriously ill and receiving treatment for that. Recently, as was mention by Past President Watson, the ITFS organization honored her with their first award of the national lifetime service award, and with your support of this resolution, I would be happy to quickly send a message off to Insight so that this Friday she will be recognized in that the Academic Senate has also thanked her for her service.

Past President Watson: Mr. President, the resolution has been made and seconded.

Parliamentarian Burstein: All those in favor say aye. Opposed? The resolution passes.

3.D President-Elect's Report (Barb Kerr).

First of all, I want to thank all of you who ran for office. Thanks for your generosity--George, it is not easy to find people who are really willing to take on these kinds of tasks, and so we want to make sure at this time to express our profound gratitude to all of those here who ran for offices, and all of the colleagues who voted.

Also, I want to recognize that this has been a year of not only many accomplishments but it has been a year of more faculty involvement in governance at this university than ever before, at least during the time that I have been here--the Task Force for Promotion and Tenure, the Task Force for University Design Team, as well as the committees that take place each year, and there have been some new ones formed this year. This year we formed new Academic Senate initiative task forces, which people generously agreed to sit on, for both groups. The people who were asked to serve unanimously accepted the service even though it does mean a lot of work. We will keep you updated on the work they do.

Finally, it is a year in which I feel personally much gratitude toward the administrators, who not only welcomed us to the table but also welcomed us as full participants.

3.E USG President's Report (Brandon Goad). No report.

President Garcia: Since Brandon has to leave we will go straight to our next new item.
3.F  Graduate Student Bill of Rights (Brian Collier, President of Graduate and Professional Student Association).

The Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSA) has recently passed a graduate student bill of rights. I believe that some of you have seen copies already. It is posted on the Academic Senate Web page, and I have already received some emails from some of you saying, why should graduate students have these things when you don't? My answer to that question is, why don't you have those things? We should have those things and so should you. The GPSA Bill of Rights speaks to many needs that have come my way this year as Graduate Student President. People have written to me about their departments not having adequate handbooks that describe ways to graduate. None of you would do this, of course, but abusing TAs by making them work more than 20 hours when they have a 20 hours assistantship--people that have to work over the breaks while their colleagues do not have to work over the break--problems with health insurance, problems with equal access, and lastly, problems with not being allowed to sit on every university committee. We are the consumers (students), but we are also faculty in training and we would like the right to sit on every department committee, the right to sit on every university committee with you, and help make these important decisions about tenure, about hiring, about computer resources, all these decisions that go on. So, we would like to be treated collegially. Therefore, we have passed this bill of rights. We hope that all of you will lend us support on this effort. We did have a very good meeting with the Student Faculty Policy Committee this morning, and we would like your support on a resolution over time. I will be writing a report talking about our peer institutions and other PAC 10 schools, and the kinds of graduate student bill of rights that they have. We have enjoyed a very good relationship with our administration this year. The Graduate College has been quite gracious in accepting our new role in ASASU, and now we would like to expand that roll to the faculty senate over time. To that end, we would like a concurrent resolution with your support behind us on this document sometime next year. This can help avert the kinds of situations we have seen just today in the Chronicle of Higher Education and the News Report, that Columbia graduate students in quite a huff left their jobs and this is at the end of the semester--you can imagine the turmoil that has transpired at Columbia. We don't want to do that. We want all these sort of rights that we can enumerate, so that we don't have to be placed in the position that the graduate students at Columbia felt they had to be today. I will be happy to take questions now, and I just really wanted to bring this as an information item.

Senator Thornton: What are the rights that you want that we do not have?

GPSA President Collier: They are enumerated in this document but specific ones--such as sitting on committees, the guarantee to health insurance for partners (and we have defined partners as anybody), and for our children we want childcare, we want handbooks, we want seats on all committees. There should not in my opinion be any committees without graduate students on them. We have talked about professionalization, and our vitas are weak compared to our peers because we don't have the kind of service that other graduate students are getting--we are not allowed to sit on the committees for tenure, promotion and hiring, and those kinds of committees. Those are the highlights. We want a computer connection (in this decade) made available in our offices, and we want access to resources. We want a code to the copy machine--these kinds of things. (Much Laughter) These are the kinds of things that graduate students want, and we will be happy to share this with you so that you can also get a code to the copy machine!

President Garcia: Thank you Brian for your patience today, and I encourage all of you who have not seen the document to do so; it is available on our Senate Web page. Please read this document over the summer.

We are now going to move in the agenda to Unfinished Business, of which there is none.
I would also like to make a very brief report about the new Emeritus College. I would like for you to keep
the following information in mind. There is a web site on the Emeritus College
(http://www.public.asu.edu/~Erjjacob/ECPublic.html) There is a proposal that is being formed as we speak
and there is a charge from Provost Glick to create a steering committee, which is headed up by Professor
Emeritus Richard Jacob from Physics and Astronomy. He is now an emeritus faculty member and is heading
this committee that will formulate the proposal for the Emeritus College. The Emeritus College basic idea is
to have an assembly of scholars made up of the emeritus faculty from ASU. They would not give classes,
they would not confer degrees. This is something that is being formulated at this point; they have been
meeting now for about 6-7 meetings and in June there will be a proposal submitted to Provost Glick. So, I
just wanted to bring this as an informational item from the Executive Committee to the full Senate.

Senator Johnson: This is a good day for motions and resolutions! I would like to propose a resolution to
the Senate to recognize the commendable start-up effort on the Emeritus College task force and that
we look forward to creative ideas for how to bring the considerable talents of the emeritus faculty to
bear on the mission of the University. (The motion was seconded.)

President Garcia: Is there any discussion of this motion? Hearing none, we will move to a vote. All in
favor signify by saying aye. All opposed? The motion carries. We will move quickly to Mike Mayer now
with items from CAPC.


6.C Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Michael Mayer).

6.C.1 Senate Motion #15 is in the agenda but I will read the motion for the record:
The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal
submitted by the WP Carey School of Business for the establishment of a Graduate Certificate in Health
Industry Leadership.

Rationale: This curricular proposal seeks to establish a structured graduate certificate in Health Industry Leadership
through the School of Health Management and Policy. The certificate program will serve as an alternative for those
students who do not wish to pursue the combined MBA and MHSM degree program, which at present is the only
option available in the W.P. Carey School of Business in the area of health management and policy. It is intended that
students obtaining the certificate will be uniquely qualified for leadership positions in a variety of health care settings
both nationally and internationally.

Are there any questions on this motion? (Jeff Wilson, Director of the School of Health Administration Policy was
present to answer questions.)

Senator Mattson: I move that we suspend the rules so that we can vote on this motion.

President Garcia: There is a motion before the house to suspend the rules (not debatable) to bring this item for a
second read and vote.

Parliamentarian Burstein: All those in favor of suspending the rules say aye. Opposed?

Senator Guleserian: Point of order, do we have a quorum?

Parliamentarian Burstein: We have a quorum as long as no one calls for a quorum.

President Garcia: Ok. Moving forward, Senate Motion #15 is up for a vote. All those in favor of this motion please
indicate by saying aye. All opposed? The motion passes.

Academic Senate Summary - April 26, 2004
6.C.2 Senate Motion #16 is in the agenda but I will read it for the record:

"The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the Colleges of Liberal Arts & Sciences and Public Programs Department of Family & Human Development – School of Social Work for the Establishment of an Undergraduate Certificate – Early Intervention."

Rationale: The Early Intervention Certificate is cross-disciplinary and is certified by the Arizona Early Intervention Program in the Arizona State Department of Economic Security. In Arizona there is a dramatic shortage of early intervention specialists trained to provide state services. Students who complete the certificate program will be Approved by AzEIP (The Arizona Early Intervention Program) for admission to an apprenticeship. They will be well-equipped to provide services in other essential intervention programs including Early Head Start and Arizona’s child abuse prevention program, Healthy Families.

(Bob Weigand, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Department of Family and Human Development, and Richard Fabes, Chair, Department of Family and Human Development, were present to answer questions on this motion.)

Senator Mayer: Are there any questions on this certificate?

Senator Mattson: I move that we suspend the rules so that we may have a second reading on this item.

Parliamentarian Burstein: All those in favor of suspending the rules please say aye.

President Garcia: Is there further discussion of this motion? Senate Motion #16 is up for a vote. All those in favor of the motion please indicate by saying aye. All opposed? The motion passes.

6.D Student-Faculty Policy Committee (Craig Allen).

At our meeting earlier today, we agreed to initiate a report on academic dishonesty; we agreed to support the Graduate Student Bill of Rights; we also agreed to recommend to the Senate that it seek reinstatement of the summer commencement, which was something that was going to come up earlier today, but we ran out of time.

Past President Watson: I am still going to talk about that under my report for the University Affairs Committee.


6.F University Affairs Committee (George Watson).

I have one item and it deals with Summer Commencement. Last summer a decision was made to do away with summer commencement. It was based on the lack of attendance. There were a couple of problems with that--first of all, the decision was made to do away with this coming August Commencement and there were many calendars which said, including the Catalog, that there would be a commencement this summer. A second problem was that it was not communicated very well in terms of that policy. Consequently, there were a number of graduate students in particular, perhaps undergraduates as well, who never got the word until within the past month that there would not be a summer commencement. Some had scheduled their courses accordingly so that they could graduate in August; some of their family members had arranged to be here in August, etc. It was a bit of a mess. The university has not consented to go forward with a commencement exercise in August but there are colleges that have responded by offering convocations for their graduates in August. You might inquire within your individual colleges as to whether that might be appropriate for your college to do. I will be submitting a report to the President of the Academic Senate, the President of the University, and the Provost, talking about what I see as problems with the way this particular policy was decided and the lack of a communication plan that permitted it to go forward in the way that it did.
President-Elect Kerr: Would you like to make a motion that the Senate recommend to deans that convocations be held?

Past President Watson: Actually not. I think we will let that work itself out.

President Garcia: Now we come to the part where we pass the Senate Gavel.


President-Elect Kerr: Tony, here is your personal gavel. We also have a plaque that we want to present to you for your service this year. You were the first Academic Senate President to ever be elected by electronic means. You were also the first Academic Senate President to be a bio-engineer, so we are very happy that you really are our first BIONIC Senate President. We feel that you have been in so many ways, a dedicated leader. You had the vision to conceive of a university senate and we only hope that we can carry forward with your vision (Tony: It is a long conception.)

You were also a Dedicated Leader in other ways; for instance you moved the Senate office, not just figuratively--we have lovely new offices in Administration B-Wing--he also literally moved his own office--he packed boxes and carried some of them over to the new office--and then throughout the whole year you always did the extra thing that needed to be done.

We have "Creative Consensus Builder" on this plaque because as you have seen, there have been many controversial issues that the President had to be deeply involved in. He was there at "all" of the meetings. In every way, Tony has been a creative consensus builder. He doesn't just work to smooth things over, he works to go to a higher ground and to find a consensus that really will be satisfying to all. I think you have seen some of that in this meeting. It is a difficult role and he has done that well.

Finally, we put on the plaque "Laid Back Visionary." That is because you probably have been one of the most relaxed presidents we have ever had. Instead of jumping up and shouting when things looked strange in print, or seemed strange in the media, Tony just says, "now that is WEIRD." That means that he is going to look into it and he is going to get on the computer and find out what every other university in the nation is doing.

So, Tony, as the President of the Academic Assembly and Senate from 2003 to 2004, we want to thank you for being our dedicated leader, our creative consensus builder, and our laid back visionary. (Applause followed.)

President Garcia: I have enjoyed serving the faculty, serving the academic professionals; serving the academic family-- that has been the best part for me. Thank you all.

President-Elect Kerr: The gavel has been passed to me, and I happily accept it. This is going to be fun and I would also like to do "the passing of the chocolate," now that I am no longer president-elect. Whenever I did have to take over for Tony this year, I was given a bag of chocolate--therefore, this year, I will do the passing of the chocolate to Sue Mattson. (Applause followed.)

I want to thank all of you for your confidence in me, and all of your help this past year, and oh boy Tony, hang around! I want to call for a motion to adjourn now (Multiple Motions and Multiple Seconds).

8. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.
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